United Nations A/54/664/Add.3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
18 May 2000

Original: English

Fifty-fourth session
Agenda item 119
Programme budget for the biennium 1998-1999

United Nations Fund for International Partnerships

Report of the Secretary-General

Summary

In line with the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Fund for International Partnerships (UNFIP) (A/54/664 and Add.1 and 2), the following addendum is submitted to inform Member States on progress in respect of the Programme Framework Group on biodiversity, which was launched in June 1999. The addendum contains the full text of the UNFIP/United Nations Foundation (UNF) programme framework on biodiversity, which has been developed in close consultation with the Programme Framework Group composed of representatives of United Nations agencies and external partners to guide the use of the United Nations Foundation contribution, which, for biodiversity, is expected to target a minimum of $30 million to this area over the next three years.

Biological diversity is declining globally and there is a need to increase efforts to conserve and sustainably use ecosystems and biological resources. In responding to this challenge, the biodiversity programme framework seeks to provide support to conservation and sustainable use of natural sites designated by the 1972 World Heritage Convention of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) for their significance in terms of global biodiversity and to promote the protection of coral reefs. Through the World Heritage component of the framework, site-based project proposals will be considered that respond to a one or more of the following objectives : (a) demonstrate an innovative response to a major biodiversity threat; (b) show how maintaining biodiversity in and around World Heritage sites is consistent with sustainable development; (c) build the capacity for effective site management; (d) use selected clusters of World Heritage sites to promote integrated bioregional planning. A second category of proposals that will be considered are those that endeavour to strengthen the network of World Heritage sites as a whole. The coral reef component of the framework will support projects that promote strategic implementation of the Coral Reef Initiative's Framework for Action and demonstrate linkages between community development and coral reef protection.

00-43766 (E) 200600

The Programme Framework Group on Biodiversity includes representatives of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), UNESCO, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the World Bank, the secretariat of the Global Environment Facility, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) and Conservation International.

United Nations Fund for International Partnerships/United Nations Foundation programme framework on biodiversity

Contents

		Paragraphs	Page
I.	Introduction	1–5	4
II.	Biodiversity Programme Framework Group participants		5
III.	Guiding framework principles	6–7	5
IV.	Framework component 1: Natural World Heritage	8–38	6
	A. Introduction	8–13	6
	B. Goal	14	7
	C. Objectives	15–36	7
	D. Outcomes	37–38	10
V.	Framework component 2: Coral reefs	39–46	11
	A. Introduction	39–45	11
	B. Goal		12
	C. Considerations	46	12
Annexes			
I.	Indicative roles of key United Nations agencies		14
II.	List of World Heritage biodiversity sites		16
III.	Biodiversity concept proposal format		18

I. Introduction

1. The United Nations Foundation (UNF) was established in January 1998 to support the United Nations and its causes — with special emphasis on population and women, the environment, children's health and selected humanitarian concerns.[1] Subsequently, the United Nations Fund for International Partnerships (UNFIP) was created by the Secretary-General to act as the central mechanism within the United Nations system for organizing, executing, monitoring and reporting on activities funded by UNF.

2. The UNF Board of Directors has identified biodiversity as an environmental priority and UNF plans to target a minimum of $30 million to this area over the next three years. Recognizing the need to take a focused programming approach, the Foundation developed a strategy paper outlining specific potential leverage points. These leverage points — determined in close consultation with United Nations experts, leading non-governmental organizations (NGOs), scientific institutions, and others — include United Nations-designated World Heritage biodiversity sites and coral reefs.[2]

3. This focus allows for the allocation of strategic grants which will have an important impact by targeting priority sites that combine rich biodiversity with realistic chances for promoting conservation and sustainable use while also demonstrating the benefits of biodiversity,[3] attracting additional resources, delivering concrete results and creating a greater sense of urgency about the need to address biodiversity loss.

4. The initial UNF strategy paper was presented formally to the United Nations system in June 1999 at the first meeting of the UNF/UNFIP Programme the Framework Group on biodiversity (PFG). The PFG, composed primarily of representatives of the United Nations organizations whose mandates most closely relate to biodiversity, further refined the strategy and worked to identify opportunities to be pursued by the United Nations within the given priorities and to propose the most effective use of UNF support. The following programme framework is the result and will serve to guide the development of project proposals over the next three to five years.

5. Relative to other UNF priorities (i.e. children's health), where the United Nations has extensive field presence, its capacity in the area of biodiversity is more limited. Thus, a successful programme will require strategic collaborations that combine the operational advantages of civil society and national partners with the Organization's comparative strengths in moral authority and international leadership, convening power, capacity-building, exchange of experience and best practices and credibility with over 130 developing countries.[4]

II. Biodiversity Programme Framework Group participants

Principal agency representatives[5]

United Nations Development Programme	Roberto Lenton, Director, Sustainable Energy and Environment Division
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Gisbert Glaser, Assistant Director-General, Environmental Programmes
United Nations Environment Programme	Adnan Amin, Regional Director for North America
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	Douglas Williamson, Wildlife and Protected Areas Management Officer, Forest Resources Division
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity	Cyriaque Sendashonga, Senior Programme Officer
World Bank	Gonzalo Castro, Biodiversity Specialist
Secretariat of the Global Environment Facility	Mario Ramos, Senior Environmental Specialist
Conservation International	Russell Mittermeier, President
International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources	David Sheppard, Head, Programme on Protected Areas

Rapporteur

United Nations Development Programme	Charles McNeill, Senior Environmental Policy Advisor, Sustainable Energy and Environment Division

Ex officio[6]

United Nations Foundation	Nicholas Lapham, Programme Officer
United Nations Fund for International Partnerships	Will Kennedy, Programme Officer

III. Guiding framework principles

6. Before 1986, the term "biodiversity" did not exist.[7] Six years later, it was a major theme at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, held in Rio de Janeiro, and today the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity has 175 parties, more than any other international agreement. This sudden rise in attention corresponds to a dramatic fall in the diversity of life. Based on current trends, the world's best scientists predict the loss of up to two thirds of all bird, mammal, butterfly and plant species by 2100.[8] Most of these losses will occur in developing countries, where people attain little or no perceived benefit from conserving and sustainably using their biodiversity.

7. The stark scientific forecast illustrates the magnitude and urgency of the biodiversity challenge. Fortunately, the key institutional arrangements are largely in place. The Convention on Biological Diversity provides an overarching global framework, while other agreements address biodiversity issues either directly or indirectly.[9] In addition, most countries have laws that provide at least some structure in this area. The challenge is to get these instruments to work better. UNF resources targeted under this programme framework will assist this goal consistent with the following guiding principles:

(a) UNF support should stimulate cooperation among United Nations agencies, increase synergy between United Nations conventions and agreements, and strengthen partnerships with NGOs, particularly at the project site level;

(b) UNF initiatives should be catalytic, seizing opportunities to leverage other funding and communicating the importance of biodiversity to a wide audience;

(c) UNF projects should emphasize involving indigenous and local communities and demonstrating linkages between conservation and sustainable development;

(d) UNF resources should have a clear "value added" benefit;

(e) UNF initiatives should aim for timely and efficient delivery of resources;[10]

(f) UNF initiatives should be consistent with country priorities and strategies.

IV. Framework component 1: Natural World Heritage

A. Introduction

"World Heritage sites should demonstrate how modern societies can manage areas to preserve universal biological values, thereby helping us to live in balance with the rest of nature. These sites can serve as examples of how protected areas with high biodiversity can be conserved while still meeting the livelihood needs of indigenous people ..."[11]

8. UNF support will target sites designated by the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO, 1972) for their biodiversity significance. Nominated by the nations in which they are located, World Heritage sites are places of "outstanding universal value ... for whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to cooperate".[12]

9. Eighty-five World Heritage sites, including 60 in the developing world, have been inscribed in whole or part because of their biodiversity value.[13] Examples are the Sundarbans of India and Bangladesh, the Galapagos Islands of Ecuador, and the Bwindi Impenetrable Forest of Uganda. Key additional sites continue to be nominated, including in such critical ecosystems as Brazil's Atlantic rainforest. As biodiversity declines globally, the importance of these sites, and the species and habitats they harbour, is increasingly being recognized — a fact evidenced by the growing interest in the Convention on the part of NGOs, scientific experts, United Nations agencies and others.[14]

10. Though they have defined boundaries, World Heritage sites are very much a part of the communities, nations, and regions in which they are located. As such, they provide rich opportunities for the United Nations to develop effective models for integrating compatible human uses with the protection of ecosystem functions and biodiversity.[15]

11. The profile and visibility of World Heritage sites further afford the potential for a targeted UNF programme to have important multiplier impacts beyond the sites themselves. These include catalysing public awareness and leveraging additional resources in the area of biodiversity, bolstering national protected area networks and building greater support for the role of the United Nations in the biodiversity field.

12. World Heritage sites provide an ideal focus for promoting strengthened coordination between United Nations conventions, including the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention), the Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora and the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals.[16] For example, article VIII of the Convention on Biological Diversity speaks to the need of parties to establish and maintain a system of protected areas, an issue the Conference of Parties is committed to dealing with in detail at its sixth meeting, scheduled for 2002. Key protected areas, including especially World Heritage sites, could act as a strategic focus for the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity.[17]

13. Despite some substantial investments in individual sites from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and others, most World Heritage sites remain badly underfunded, particularly in the developing world.[18] This is especially problematic when many sites are under increasing threat, and the number of sites — and the total area they cover — is poised for rapid expansion. UNF, therefore, is well positioned to have a major impact both by increasing available resources and in catalysing a broader base of support.

B. Goal

Promote effective action for biodiversity by using World Heritage sites to implement key objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity as well as other relevant United Nations conventions and agreements

14. The United Nations Foundation intends to support a World Heritage programme composed of initiatives that meet one or more of the five objectives identified below. Taken together, these initiatives should result in the outcomes described at the end of this section.

C. Objectives

Objective 1

Address significant threats to biodiversity by developing replicable models at the site level

Context/rationale

15. Five categories of threats to biodiversity are commonly regarded as most significant.[19] They are:

(a) Habitat loss and fragmentation (e.g. logging, mining and land conversion);

(b) Over-harvesting of biological resources (e.g. poaching, over-fishing, over-grazing, deforestation, bush-meat trade);

(c) Species introductions (e.g. alien invasive species);

(d) Pollution and reduced ecosystem functions (e.g. effect of fires, loss of soil biota; eutrophication of rivers);

(e) Potential climate change.

16. World Heritage sites face each of these threats to varying degrees, whether invasive species in Ecuador's Galapagos Islands, mining in Peru's Huascaran National Park, poaching in the Democratic Republic of the Congo's Salonga National Park or illegal fishing in Indonesia's Komodo National Park. If these and other World Heritage sites cannot be effectively protected against such threats, it raises serious questions about where biodiversity can be effectively maintained. In fact, these sites should serve as global models that offer replicable strategies for effective conservation.

17. A recent UNF-funded initiative in the Galapagos demonstrates how Foundation resources can assist in achieving this objective. The project addresses the problem of invasive species, a major threat to biodiversity identified in article VIII of the Convention on Biological Diversity.[20] A local NGO will undertake operations, in partnership with the Galapagos National Park, to initiate priority control, eradication and prevention measures on-site. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) will provide technical assistance to help establish a quarantine inspection system both in Galapagos and in mainland Ecuador. The UNESCO World Heritage Centre will monitor the project and, in partnership with the UNESCO Biosphere Reserve Programme, enable a thorough and ongoing peer-review of project achievements and outputs, including scientific assessment of the potential for applying the lessons learned in Galapagos to problems of invasive species management elsewhere.[21] Through a challenge grant, UNF is working with the project partners to catalyse a permanent endowment for Galapagos conservation by targeting private sector resources.

Strategic areas for United Nations Foundation focus

18. UNF will be looking to support initiatives that address one or more of the five categories of threats to biodiversity identified above. Over a three to five year period, the aim is to have a balanced set of initiatives covering a range of issues and a mix of priority ecosystems (i.e. tropical forests, coral reefs, savannahs, etc.).[22] Individual projects should emphasize:

(a) Linking on-the-ground initiatives with upstream efforts that seek to generate increased political and public will for taking action on a given issue;

(b) Connecting conservation in World Heritage sites with activities in the surrounding area, with particular attention to the "ecosystem approach" of the Convention on Biological Diversity and to the Biosphere Reserve concept where applicable;

(c) Promoting innovative financing mechanisms (i.e. trust funds, debt-for-nature swaps, user fees) to ensure sustainable conservation results;

(d) Building in a mandatory communications component to stimulate the effective dissemination of lessons learned; and

(e) Establishing strategic partnerships with GEF, the World Bank, bilateral agencies, the private sector and others to ensure that UNF funds are catalytic.

Objective 2
Promote innovative linkages between biodiversity conservation and sustainable development

Context/rationale

19. Relations with local and indigenous communities are a critical aspect of protected area management. World Heritage sites should showcase the effective integration of sustainable local development with conservation by demonstrating how conservation can contribute to local and national economic development, culture, and pride. The challenge is to support models that integrate compatible human uses with the protection of ecosystem functions and biodiversity. (World Heritage sites that are also Biosphere Reserves may provide particularly suitable conditions in this regard.) This need is clearly envisioned in the Convention on Biological Diversity (see, for example, the preamble on the role of indigenous and local communities and women, article VI on cross-sectoral plans and policies and article X on sustainable use).

20. At the same time, the success rate of integrated conservation and development projects has been relatively low, with many initiatives failing to deliver the desired combination of concrete benefits for conservation and improvements in the livelihoods of targeted beneficiaries. UNF should be careful to ensure that projects in this area incorporate lessons learned over the past decade.

Strategic areas for United Nations Foundation focus

21. UNF will be looking for projects in the following areas:

(a) Community-based enterprises that sustainably use biological resources to improve livelihoods while providing incentives for conserving World Heritage sites (i.e. nature based tourism, non-timber forest products, environmental services, community artisanship);

(b) Innovative mechanisms for revenue capture that involve conservation-business partnerships and contribute to stability of recurrent cost financing for World Heritage site management as well as to ecologically sustainable livelihoods for local residents;[23]

(c) Linkages between the conservation of animal and plant genetic resources and potential agriculture and food production;

(d) Initiatives that tie in with UNF's other priority areas, including climate change/sustainable energy, women and population and children's health.

22. Particular emphasis will be given to initiatives that relate to indigenous peoples, whose knowledge of, and roles in managing, key protected areas need to be better acknowledged. As in objective 1, projects should emphasize sustainable financing mechanisms, build in a mandatory communications component, and strive to develop strategic partnerships.

Objective 3
Build the capacity necessary to sustain protected areas into the next century

Context/rationale

23. Article VIII of the Convention on Biological Diversity emphasizes the importance of protected areas to biodiversity conservation. Viable protected areas combine professional management, adequate financing, effective communication and public and community support. Without these interrelated ingredients, protected areas are unlikely to maintain their biodiversity or meet the other objectives for which they were established. World Heritage sites should be model protected areas, providing replicable examples of best practices.

24. For this objective to be realized, capacity-building is essential at a variety of levels. At the site itself, motivated, well-trained and well-equipped managers are critical to success. Yet even in some of the world's best known World Heritage sites, individuals in the field lack access to the tools and training they need to do their job well. Of course, this can a so reflect an institutional problem and efforts to build capacity are not likely to succeed if they focus on individuals without attention to the institutions through which they operate.

25. Experience shows that even the best protected area managers cannot ensure the integrity of a site on their own. Partnerships with NGOs and the private

sector are increasingly essential. The examples of the Galapagos Islands, where the Charles Darwin Research Station assists park staff in managing and monitoring the site and helps to increase public attention and support for the park in Ecuador and around the world and the Acadia National Park in the United States, where a private endowment was recently established to cover the recurrent costs of trail maintenance and improvement, are excellent models of such partnerships.

Strategic areas for United Nations Foundation focus

26. UNF will be looking for projects that:

(a) Build professionalism in protected area management, including through:

(i) Demonstrating operational models for cooperation among site staff, academic/training institutions (particularly those in the developing world) and individual specialists to improve monitoring and management of sites;

(ii) Forging stronger linkages between managers and key target audiences, including youth, women, and local communities, with the goal of increasing support for conservation and promoting protected area management as a viable career option;

(iii) Generating a growing volume of "learning resources" (e.g. case studies) as a contribution to refining the core content of the protected area management discipline;

(iv) Forging linkages between World Heritage site managers working in different parts of the world.[24]

(b) Stimulate the development or build the capacity of locally based NGOs dedicated to the long-term conservation of targeted sites;

(c) Support innovative partnerships between the private sector and targeted sites that provide sustainable financing for conservation.

27. UNF will place particular emphasis on promoting South-South cooperation and capacity-building wherever possible.

Objective 4

Use selected clusters of World Heritage sites (including proposed sites) to promote integrated bioregional planning

Context/rationale

28. Bioregional planning is an increasingly important tool for effectively maintaining biodiversity while simultaneously promoting sustainable development in both terrestrial and marine systems.[25] The Meso American Biological Corridor, a ground-breaking conservation project that spans across seven Central American nations, is perhaps the most ambitious experiment testing this approach.[26] In such transboundary situations, bioregional planning can also be an effective mechanism for promoting conflict mitigation and prevention, including the development of peace parks.

29. The Berastagi policy dialogue on World Heritage Forests concluded, "To most effectively conserve natural heritage values, the best answer might be sites of differing sizes, clusters of sites, or sites linked by corridors of natural habitat".[27] This concept represents an exciting evolution of the World Heritage idea, that is to think in terms of a group or cluster of sites linked together through surrounding landscapes whose management emphasizes the interdependency of people and their environment.

Strategic areas for United Nations Foundation focus

30. UNF will identify a very limited set of high-priority bioregions where an inter-linked set of proposed/existing World Heritage sites offers the chance for an integrated planning approach. Initiatives would seek to use World Heritage as a way of linking key areas together either within a country or where appropriate between neighbours (i.e. through peace parks or other such transboundary conservation areas).

31. It is particularly crucial that UNF support be catalytic and very carefully targeted in this area. Effective bioregional planning is a complicated, expensive and long-term endeavour, particularly when more than one country is involved. UNF's key role here will be to energize a process that draws support and enthusiasm from involved Governments and major donors.

32. Special emphasis will be given to opportunities for capitalizing on the comparative advantage of the United Nations in peace-building, conflict prevention and conflict mitigation. Some of the most biologically important places remaining in the world occur along shared national borders or in areas of conflict. Several current World Heritage sites (i.e. the La Amistad/Talamanca Range Reserves in Costa Rica and Panama, the Sundarbans of India and Bangladesh and the set of sites in Africa's Great Lakes region) offer exciting potential in this regard, while other areas seem promising for a World Heritage focus (i.e. the Guiana Shield and the Northern Andes in South America and the tropical forest corridor of Central and West Africa).

Objective 5

Promote strategic initiatives designed to strengthen the World Heritage biodiversity network as a whole

Context/rationale

33. The four objectives described above emphasize site-level initiatives targeted to a particular World Heritage site or cluster of sites. UNF should also explore catalytic opportunities for strengthening the World Heritage network more broadly. Two logical goals include encouraging greater sharing of experience between sites to improve management and promoting the strategic expansion of the World Heritage list to increase the Convention's biodiversity coverage.

34. A good example is the Berastagi policy dialogue on World Heritage Forests referred to above, which produced a number of recommendations for improving management of existing sites and a list of candidate sites that the assembled experts felt would substantially improve the Convention's tropical forest biodiversity coverage. UNESCO, in cooperation with NGOs and technical experts, is following up on these recommendations. The structure of the Berastagi dialogue could be usefully replicated for other key biomes, including coral reefs, marine areas, savannas and mountain ecosystems.

35. An alternative and possibly complementary notion would be to take a theme-based approach, bringing World Heritage site managers and other experts together to explore issues such as sustainable financing, tourism management, biodiversity monitoring and assessment.

Strategic areas of focus

36. This objective will receive proportionally less funding than objectives 1 to 4 above. UNF will be looking for limited opportunities to provide support for:

(a) Initiatives that encourage the sharing of experiences between sites with the goal of improving management;

(b) Targeted efforts to promote the strategic expansion of World Heritage biodiversity coverage.

D. Outcomes

37. Although both are focused on the results of UNF investments, UNF sees framework-level outcomes as distinct from project-level outcomes. Outcomes at the framework level correspond to UNF's mission and programmatic priorities, serving as broad parameters against which UNF assesses its efforts and overall strategy. Outcomes at the project level should be specified by those designing the project, impact-oriented and pertain to the effect of a specific intervention on the biodiversity goals of that intervention.

38. The framework-level outcomes stemming from this component of the UNF/UNFIP biodiversity framework, all of which will contribute to implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity, include the following:

(a) The UNF World Heritage programme will lead to the improved sustainability of some of the world's most biologically important protected areas. Specifically, each UNF-supported initiative should generate quantified, specific improvements in the conservation of biodiversity and enhanced, broad-based support for that site's protected status;

(b) The UNF World Heritage programme will assist broader efforts to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity by informing policy development and feeding into key national, regional, and global forums.[28] Specifically, each UNF-supported site (or cluster of sites) will be used as a robust case study illustrating tangible and effective responses (and failures) in the area of biodiversity;

(c) The UNF World Heritage programme will raise significant additional resources from other

donors, including the private sector, targeted to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity;

(d) The UNF World Heritage programme will showcase innovative partnerships in the field of biodiversity. Specifically, each UNF project will demonstrate cooperation between United Nations agencies (with particular roles for each clearly articulated), among United Nations conventions and agreements, and/or with NGOs and the private sector.

V. Framework component 2: coral reefs*

A. Introduction

39. Consistent with the Convention on Biological Diversity and other international agreements, UNF seeks to work with the United Nations system to play a catalytic role in helping to reverse the degradation of coral reefs around the world.

40. Coral reefs provide a compelling example of the link between maintaining healthy ecosystems and promoting sustainable development. These "rainforests of the sea" provide critical habitat and nurseries for an abundance of marine species, including many of subsistence and commercial importance, attract tourist dollars that often underpin local economies and protect coastal communities from the brunt of hurricanes and storm surges.

41. Agenda 21, the United Nations sustainable development charter, reflects the need to encourage sound management of coral reefs. Specifically, chapter 17 called on States to take special care of marine ecosystems exhibiting high levels of biodiversity and productivity, giving special priority to coral reefs as well as seagrass beds and mangroves. UNEP, UNDP and UNESCO are among the leading United Nations agencies with activities in coral reef environments.

42. Recognizing the significance of coral reefs, eight nations came together in 1994 to create the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI). At the first ICRI global workshop the following year, a framework for action was developed. This framework has now been endorsed by more than 80 countries and is widely seen as a blueprint for international cooperation aimed at addressing the declining condition of the world's reefs. As such, it is a logical guide for UNF actions.

43. In January 1999, the board of UNF approved the start-up phase of a five-year umbrella programme to promote strategic implementation of the ICRI framework. The programme, the International Coral Reef Action Network (ICRAN), is a joint initiative of UNEP and the International Center for Living Aquatic Resources Management[29] in cooperation with a number of other United Nations and non-United Nations partners.[30] It consists of a set of inter-linked implementation, assessment and communications activities, which will reduce coral reef degradation by demonstrating good management and conservation practices and promoting their proliferation.

44. The start-up phase for the International Coral Reef Action Network officially began in June 1999. Its primary task is to produce a detailed strategic implementation plan for the four-year activity phase starting immediately thereafter.[31] This plan will be based on a rigorous analysis of needs (met and unmet) within each coral reef region of the world. It will contain a prioritized set of proposed actions that fill key gaps, clearly identify the roles of project partners and include a strategy for leveraging resources from the private sector, bilateral aid agencies and others, including the development of an innovative coral reef fund. Special attention will be focused on the role of the UNEP regional seas programmes in implementing ICRAN, and a coroliary benefit of the initiative will be to strengthen these United Nations nodes.

45. The extent of coral reefs, the multiple threats they face and the relatively high level of existing donor activity all point to the risk of UNF resources being diluted unless carefully directed. UNF and the PFG agree that ICRAN may offer an ideal vehicle for avoiding this problem by identifying a catalytic window for UNF support. All PFG members, both United Nations and non-United Nations, have been encouraged to contribute to developing the ICRAN strategic plan and will review it before it is adopted in its final form.

* This component of the strategy remains under development, and projects are not currently being solicited.

B. Goal

Promote strategic implementation of the International Coral Reef Initiative's Framework for Action

C. Considerations

46. Specific objectives and outcomes will be identified pending the completion of the final ICRAN strategic plan (expected by spring 2000). As input to that process, the PFG identified the following principles that it feels should be taken into account.

(a) UNF support should be action-oriented and demonstrate the linkages between community development and coral reef protection;

(b) Integrated coastal management is a primary means of reducing threats to coral reefs and involves alternative livelihoods and sustainable uses. United Nations agencies are well positioned in this work and it may be a clear area of focus, along with establishing Marine Protected Areas, which promote tailored models of multi-use reserves based on co-management approaches;

(c) Attracting private sector funding for coral reefs is critical;

(d) Natural linkages exist with the World Heritage component of the strategy and should be pursued;

(e) Coral reef conservation cannot be viewed without looking at related issues of fisheries management;

(f) UNF's role must be clearly defined and strategic in light of the substantial funding efforts of others (i.e. the World Bank and the Global Environment Facility);

(g) While on-the-ground projects are important, UNF support should also be linked to global and regional initiatives.

Notes

[1] For a more detailed description of the history, structure and broad criteria of UNF, visit its web site at *www.unfoundation.org*.

[2] This by necessity leaves out many important and legitimate United Nations initiatives aimed at implementing the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The programme framework will be evaluated regularly to ensure that the direction being taken provides maximum impact.

[3] Benefits can take a variety of forms whether economic, social, cultural, health or spiritual. They can come from goods (i.e. harvest of plants and animals for medicine and food) or services (i.e. watershed protection or pollination). A key need is to better develop, quantify and communicate the linkages between biodiversity and human well-being.

[4] The idea of building partnerships in the field of biodiversity is explicitly referenced both in the preamble and in article V of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

[5] Additional participants included Peter Bridgewater (UNESCO), Natarajan Ishwaran (UNESCO), Mireille Jardin (UNESCO), El Hadji Sene (FAO), Murthi Anishetty (FAO), Jaime Hurtubia (UNEP), Ralph Schmidt (UNDP), Yibin Xiang (CBD), Pedro Rosabal (IUCN), Cyril Kormos (Conservation International) and John McManus (ICLARM).

[6] Additional participants included Melissa Pailthorp (UNF), Seema Paul (UNF) and Paola Sartorio (UNFIP).

[7] E. O. Wilson, *Biodiversity II*, Joseph Henry Press, p. 1.

[8] Peter Raven, speech to the International Botanical Congress, 3 August 1999.

[9] For example, the World Heritage Convention, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals and the Convention on the Law of the Sea.

[10] The inability to get funds on the ground quickly, even in small increments, has been recognized by PFG as an important deficiency in international environmental donor assistance. Excessive delays in providing resources to merit-worthy projects often exacerbate crises or allow windows of opportunity to pass. Furthermore, slow responses fuel criticism of the United Nations. One of the UNF/UNFIP's key value-added advantages should be in overcoming this problem by delivering resources quickly. In fact, UNF may wish to establish, in consultation with UNFIP and PFG members, a limited rapid response facility to address critical short-term needs consistent with this framework.

[11] *World Heritage Forests: The World Heritage Convention as a mechanism for conserving tropical forest biodiversity*, Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Government of Indonesia, UNESCO World Heritage Centre, December 1998, p. 10.

[12] UNESCO World Heritage Convention, preamble and article 6. See *www.unesco.org/whc/*.

[13] This includes all sites inscribed under article 2, Natural criteria (iv) as containing, "the most important and significant natural habitats for *in situ* conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation".

[14] See, for example, *World Heritage Forests: The World Heritage Convention as a mechanism for conserving tropical forest biodiversity*, a policy dialogue sponsored by CIFOR, the Government of Indonesia and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Berastagi, Indonesia, December 1998.

[15] It is important to note that many World Heritage sites, in whole or part, are also listed under other site-based conventions or programmes which also emphasize wise use, such as the Convention on Wetlands and the UNESCO-MAB World Network of Biosphere Reserves.

[16] Possible Linkages could also be explored with other United Nations conventions that are not as closely linked with biodiversity, including the Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention to Combat Desertification.

[17] See *Cooperation with Other Agreements, Institutions and Processes Relevant to in situ Conservation*, a Note by the Executive Secretary of the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, 11 March 1998.

[18] The Convention's official financing mechanism, the UNESCO World Heritage Fund, has a total annual budget of only some $4 million to cover more than 600 cultural and natural sites.

[19] See, for example, *Recommendations for a core set of indicators of biodiversity*, Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technical Advice, Convention on Biological Diversity, third meeting, 1-5 September 1997.

[20] For more information on this project see the UNF web site at *www.unfoundation.org*.

[21] Particular attention will be paid to integrating this work with that of the Diversitas Global Invasive Species Programme. Diversitas is an initiative sponsored by UNESCO and the International Council for Scientific Unions (ICSU).

[22] In identifying threats to particular sites and opportunities for addressing them, special consideration should be paid to the IUCN State of Conservation reporting, which provides an existing mechanism for monitoring and reporting on the status of natural World Heritage sites. This mechanism may also be useful in assessing the success of UNF-funded initiatives.

[23] Noting linkages with the Biosphere Reserve network and the small and medium-sized enterprises programme of the International Finance Corporation.

[24] UNF will try to maximize its leverage in this area by working with existing networks such as the emerging World Heritage managers network and the World Commission on Protected Areas of IUCN, which have objectives related to training and capacity-building.

[25] The Biosphere Reserve and Ecosystem Management approach has relevance for integrating conservation and development over large spatial scales and hence could contribute to effective bioregional planning.

[26] A joint declaration of Central American presidents described the corridor as: a territorially organized system composed of natural areas under special administrative regimes, buffer zones of multiple use, and interconnecting areas, all of which are organized and consolidated to provide a range of environmental goods and services for the benefit of Central America and the world, creating necessary social spaces to ensure the promotion of sustainable use of natural resources, with the objective of contributing to the improved quality of life for the inhabitants of the region.

[27] See *World Heritage Forests: The World Heritage Convention as a mechanism for conserving tropical forest biodiversity*, a policy dialogue sponsored by CIFOR, the Government of Indonesia and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Berastagi, Indonesia, December 1998. Copies available from CIFOR (cifor@cgiar.org).

[28] For example, the World Parks Congress in 2002 and the sixth Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity on Protected Areas.

[29] The International Center for Living Aquatic Resources Management is a collaborating centre affiliated with the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) and is widely respected as a leading authority in the area of coral reefs. It is based in Manila.

[30] These include the International Coral Reef Initiative and its secretariat (currently hosted by the French Government), the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC), the Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network (supported by UNESCO and the International Oceanographic Commission), the Train-Sea-Coast programme (supported by UNDP), the Coral Reef Alliance, and the World Resources Institute (WRI).

[31] Other activities undertaken during the start-up phase include establishing integrated coastal management (ICM)/marine protected area (MPA) demonstration sites in the Caribbean; assessing the record of ICM/MPA projects in East Africa and the West Indian Ocean island States; and initiating a reefs at risk project for south-east Asia.

Annex I

Indicative roles of key United Nations agencies

1. All of the PFG agencies have activities in the biodiversity arena that relate to the priorities identified in the United Nations Foundation/United Nations Fund for International Partnerships (UNF/UNFIP) biodiversity programme framework. UNF/UNFIP anticipates that these agencies would be the primary recipients of funding flowing from proposals developed under the framework. What follows are brief descriptions of the potential indicative roles of each agency. These are not intended to be comprehensive, but rather aim to provide a quick overview of how the United Nations system will interface with UNF/UNFIP in this area.

United Nations Development Programme

2. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) promotes the adoption of integrated approaches to managing natural resources for the improvement of livelihoods of people living in poverty and is the primary United Nations agency in capacity-building for sustainable development. UNDP has extensive in-country presence in 136 developing countries and implements a range of programmes related to policy advice and institution strengthening in the areas of good governance, environmental protection and regeneration, advancement of women and sustainable livelihoods. Of particular relevance to the UNF biodiversity framework is UNDP's network of country offices throughout the world, which can support the design and implementation of UNF projects. Importantly, UNDP's role as coordinator of the United Nations family through its resident coordinator function can provide a mechanism for inter-agency collaboration. UNDP's Sustainable Energy and Environment Division (SEED) offers countries programmes on sustainable agriculture, forests and water, dryland management and other related themes. As one of the three implementing agencies of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), UNDP manages over 160 biodiversity projects in more than 120 countries with a funding level of $395 million. In addition, UNDP manages the GEF Small Grants Programme, which supports community-based NGO projects related to biodiversity and other GEF concerns, and has thus far provided more than 500 grants of $50,000 or less to grassroots groups in 46 developing countries. The expertise and in-country experience developed through these programmes will be helpful in implementing the UNF biodiversity strategy.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

3. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) operations relate to the UNF strategy in a variety of ways, consistent with the organization's mandate to help achieve a more peaceful world through the promotion of science, education and culture. Most significantly, UNESCO houses the World Heritage Centre (WHC), which is responsible for the day-to-day management of the World Heritage Convention. The Centre assists in the preparation of nominations for World Heritage sites, mobilizes international assistance for listed sites, organizes training courses for site managers and monitors implementation of the Convention. Under UNESCO's Division of Natural Sciences, additional programmes that relate to biodiversity include the Man and the Biosphere Programme, which hosts the World Network of Biosphere Reserves, and the International Oceanographic Commission, which organizes the Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network. UNESCO, while not a field agency per se, has regional and country offices that assist in implementation of its environmental programmes.

United Nations Environment Programme

4. UNEP is involved in a variety of activities that relate to the biodiversity framework. In the coral reefs area, the UNEP Regional Seas Programme works towards the protection of shared marine and water resources and could be a focal point for implementation of the International Coral Reef Action Network, as described in the framework. Through a partnership with the World Conservation Monitoring Centre, UNEP is active in developing and maintaining databases on the world's threatened animal and plant species. In 1995, UNEP produced the *Global Biodiversity Assessment*, the most comprehensive report of its kind, cataloguing the extent and condition of the world's biodiversity. UNEP also monitors the

Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, which covers the international trade in such species. UNEP's Industry and Environment Office in Paris works on sustainable tourism issues, including building partnerships with the private sector.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

5. Consistent with its priority to promote a long-term strategy for the conservation and management of natural resources through encouraging sustainable agriculture, forestry, fisheries and rural development, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) has several programmes that may be relevant to the UNF strategy. They include: the Integrated Pest Management Initiative, which teaches farmers about the beneficial role that native insect fauna can play in pest control; the Community Forest Programme, which deals with community-based enterprises and innovative business-conservation partnerships; the Forestry Education Programme, which develops wilderness trails to involve, educate and motivate local people and develop their capacity to work in the field of ecotourism; and the Wildlife and Protected Area Programme, which emphasizes integrating sustainable rural development with protected area management and is launching an important initiative on the bush-meat trade.

Secretariat of the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity

6. The primary functions of the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity are to arrange for and service meetings of the Conference of States parties to the Convention, to coordinate with other relevant international bodies, to prepare reports on the execution of its functions and to perform the functions assigned to it by any protocol and such other functions as may be determined by the Conference of States parties. As custodians of the decisions of the Conference of States parties on programme priorities in the different thematic areas and cross-cutting issues of the Convention, the secretariat is well placed to provide (or advise as appropriate) UNF/UNFIP with the most updated information on these priorities. This may assist in evaluating project proposals that aim to implement the Convention on the ground.

Annex II

List of World Heritage biodiversity sites

1. The following is a list of World Heritage biodiversity sites in developing countries. These are defined by the World Heritage Convention as containing the most important and significant natural habitats for *in situ* conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation. UNF support will be primarily limited to initiatives focused on these sites.

Argentina
Iguazu National Park
Peninsula Valdés

Bangladesh
The Sundarbans

Belize
Belize Barrier Reef System

Brazil
Iguacu National Park
Discovery Coast Atlantic Forest Reserves
South-east Atlantic Forest Reserves

Cameroon
Dja Faunal Reserve

Central African Republic
Manovo-Gounda St. Floris National Park

China
Mount Huangshan
Mount Emei Scenic Area
Mount Wuyi

Colombia
Los Kaitos National Park

Costa Rica
Cocos Island National Park
Area de Conservación Guanacaste

Costa Rica/Panama
Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves/La Amistad National Park

Côte d'Ivoire
Tai National Park
Comoé National Park

Democratic Republic of the Congo
Virunga National Park
Garamba National Park
Kahuzi-Biega National Park
Okapi Wildlife Reserve

Dominica
Morne Trois Pitons National Park

Ecuador
Galapagos Islands
Sangay National Park

Ethiopia
Simien National Park

Guatemala
Tikal National Park

Guinea and Côte d'Ivoire
Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve

Honduras
Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve

India
Kaziranga National Park
Manas Wildlife Sanctuary
Keoladeo National Park
Sundarbans National Park
Nanda Devi National Park

Indonesia
Ujung Kulon National Park
Komodo National Park
Lorentz National Park

Kenya
Sibiloi/Central Island National Parks

Madagascar
Tsingy de Bemaraha Strict Nature Reserve

Malawi
Lake Malawi National Park

Mauritania
Banc d'Arguin National Park

Mexico
Sian Ka'an
Whale Sanctuary of El Viscaino

Nepal
Royal Chitwan National Park

Niger
Aire and Ténéré Natural Reserves
"W" National Park of Niger

Oman
Arabian Oryx Sanctuary

Panama
Darien National Park

Peru
Manu National Park
Rio Abiseo National Park

Philippines
Tubbataha Reef Marine Park
Puerto Princesa Subterranean River National Park

Senegal
Niokolo-Koba National Park
Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary

Seychelles
Aldabra Atoll
Vallée de Mai Nature Reserve

South Africa
Greater St. Lucia Wetland Park

Sri Lanka
Sinharaja Forest Reserve

Thailand
Thungyai-Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuaries

Tunisia
Ichkeul National Park

Uganda
Bwindi Impenetrable National Park
Rwenzori Mountains National Park

United Republic of Tanzania
Ngorongoro Conservation Area
Serengeti National Park
Selous Game Reserve

Venezuela
Canaima National Park

Zimbabwe
Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas

Annex III

Biodiversity concept proposal format

(not to exceed three pages in length)

Provisional project title:

Proposed duration:

Geographic location:

World Heritage Site(s):

Proposing United Nations agency:

Project partners:

(United Nations agencies, non-governmental and other organizations involved)

National counterpart institutions:

Estimated project budget/costs:

Proposed UNF/UNFIP funding requested:

Project description:

In describing the project concept, please address the following issues:

- Briefly describe the project context (current situation).
- What are the unmet needs the project seeks to fill?
- What are the project's immediate objectives and what measurable and achievable results are expected?
- What makes the project particularly innovative or exceptional?
- Who are the primary beneficiaries of the project and how are they to be affected?
- How does the project relate to the UNF/UNFIP Biodiversity Programme Framework?
- What is the project's relationship to national biodiversity strategies and UNDAF (if applicable)?
- Which stakeholders have been involved in development of the project concept (local communities, non-governmental organizations, protected area managers, etc.)?
- What is the nature and extent of national/local government commitment to the project?
- What are the anticipated roles of the major project partners (i.e. who is going to do what)?
- What is the expertise and capacity of project partners to implement the project?
- How will project results be sustained?
- What opportunities exist for attracting co-financing, including matching funds?[a]

Contact information:

(Full name of contact person plus their address, phone, fax and e-mail)

---

a In order to maximize the benefits of its assistance, UNF seeks to leverage additional financing from other sources. In addition to traditional co-financing modalities, UNF has a particular interest in "matching fund" arrangements, whereby contributions from other public and private donors, including corporations and foundations, are routed through UNF project accounts and matched by UNF resources.